opponents, in insisting upon a judgment bond, and that Clerks of Court ought not to be allowed to practice as attorneys. The House, unanimously, concurred in the report and, then, the same committee reported as to the forms of bonds demanded in the Provincial or Secretary's office, in the land office, and in the Commissary General's office. This report was recommitted and the Committee was instructed to bring in three separate reports covering these offices. When they did so, they omitted a portion of the report as to the land office, which tended to show less oppressive conditions there recently.

The report concerning officers' fees was adopted on May 28, by a vote of 44 to 2, Hooper and Dulany casting the only negative votes and only four members (viz. two from Calvert, one from Somerset and one from Cecil) being absent. On the same day, by a vote of 10 to 30, the House voted not to allow the Attorney General fees for certain services. Several of the strong Proprietary men were absent at this division.

The House voted, on May 29, that it considered alienation fines charged upon devises to be a grievance, by 41 to 2, Dulany and Calder of Kent casting the negative votes, and, upon the same day, by a vote of 43 to 2, approved the report which complained of the exaction of bonds by the Secretary. Both Annapolis men were absent and Harris and Hynson of Kent cast the negative No more divisions occurred until June 5. The House meanwhile, on May 30, sent an Address to Ogle, justifying their claim that the law of 1704 for the support of government was no longer legally in force and that, therefore, that it was right to pass a temporary act for that purpose. On the same day the Committee of Aggrievances made a report, properly condemning the sale, which they had discovered, to their enemy, John Leeds, of the Clerkship of Talbot County by the prior incumbent. This matter was referred to the next Session. On May 31, the same busy Committee reported that Baltimore's proclamations that he intended to vacate patents of land, when these contained surplus, might "prove of the highest and most pernicious consequence." The daily Aggrievance on June 1, was that Chancery Court, without authority of law, had appointed a new officer to collect fees.

Meantime, bills were passing from one House to the other. On June 5, the House voted to draft a new act for purchasing arms to endure for three years, instead of one, by vote of 24 to 17, and then voted, 9 to 32, not to pass the act at all, in spite of the impending war with Spain. The affirmative votes were cast by Dulany, Gordon, Harris, Henry and Gale, who were usually on the Proprietary side and by Waughop, Middleton, Hanson, and Trippe. On that day, Ogle sent a long answer to their address, defending the validity of the law of 1704. The House sent a new address to him, instantly, in which it summarized all its complaints and appended copies thereto of reports of